BEFORE THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

In the Matter of

MICHAEL P. RIDGE, M.D.

License No. 15513
For the Practice of Allopathic Medicine
In the State of Arizona.

Case No. MD-12-1172A

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

(Letter of Reprimand and Probation)

The Arizona Medical Board ("Board") considered this matter at its public meeting on June 6, 2013. Michael P. Ridge, M.D. ("Respondent") appeared with legal counsel Scott J. Hergenroether before the Board for a Formal Interview pursuant to the authority vested in the Board by A.R.S. § 32-1451(H). The Board voted to issue Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order after due consideration of the facts and law applicable to this matter.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The Board is the duly constituted authority for the regulation and control of the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- 2. Respondent is the holder of license number 15513 for the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- 3. The Board initiated case number MD-12-1172A after receiving a complaint regarding Respondent's care and treatment of a 47 year-old male patient ("DS") alleging inappropriate prescribing, and failure to properly diagnose and treat.
- 4. On July 25, 2011, DS established care at Cottonwood Medical Center (CMC) and was seen by Respondent's Physician Assistant (PA) for left foot pain for six months, and he was prescribed Norco and Lyrica. DS did not report that he had received a prescription for #30 Norco at an urgent care the previous day or that he had received additional narcotics from other providers.

- 5. On July 30, 2011, Respondent saw DS and provided a 10-day supply of Percocet. DS returned to CMC four days later and received an early prescription for Percocet, and he was referred to neurology.
- 6. Five days later, DS saw Respondent and received a prescription for a 30-day supply of Percocet. He subsequently called and reported that he accidently threw away his medication and received prescriptions for Lorazepam and Oxycodone-Acetaminophen.
- 7. On August 16, 2011, DS was seen by neurology and was prescribed #60 Oxycontin. On August 22, 2011, DS received additional prescriptions for Percocet and Lorazepam. Four days later, he called for more medication and was told it was too early.
- 8. On August 28, 2011, DS was seen in the ER for chest pain and anxiety. He was prescribed Lorazepam and discharged.
- 9. DS returned to CMC the following day and a Controlled Substance Prescription Monitoring Program (CSPMP) query showed that he received narcotics from multiple providers. The PA provided prescriptions for Clonazepam and Percocet.
- 10. On September 6, 2011, DS returned to CMC and received a prescription for #56 Percocet. On September 19, 2011, DS saw a pain management specialist. A lumbar sympathetic block was performed and DS was prescribed Percocet.
- 11. Two days later, DS was seen at CMC pain improvement was noted. DS reported craving opioids after running out a few days previously. The PA's assessment included opioid dependence and opioid withdrawal, and he prescribed a 14-day tapered dose of Hydrocodone-Acetaminophen. Three days later, Respondent saw DS and wrote a duplicate prescription for Hydrocodone-Acetaminophen. On September 26, 2011, DS returned to CMC and received a prescription for Percocet. Four days later, the PA saw DS and provided another Percocet prescription.

- 12. On October 4, 2011, DS returned to CMC and was prescribed Clonazepam and Percocet. He later obtained narcotic prescriptions from urgent care providers and requested to fill his Percocet early. The request was granted, with documentation that DS would no longer obtain pain medications from Respondent or his PA.
- 13. The pain management provider subsequently ordered a lumbar MRI and prescribed Percocet. After the MRI was obtained, DS received an additional prescription for Percocet of increased strength.
- 14. On November 11, 2011, DS returned to CMC, and the PA's assessment included opioid dependence and drug seeking behavior. DS was later discharged from the clinic. DS established care with another provider, reported that he was addicted to Percocet and experiencing withdrawal, and he was started on Suboxone.
- 15. The Medical Consultant (MC) observed that Respondent provided early prescriptions for narcotic medications after a CSPMP query showed that DS had received narcotics from other sources. The MC further observed that the chart notes of Respondent and his PA showed duplication of large amounts of information from previous notes.
- 16. During the Formal Interview, Respondent admitted that he had missed significant red flags in managing the patient.
- 17. At the Formal Interview, Board members expressed concern that Respondent had taken an intensive course in prescribing prior to treating DS, but seemed to have learned nothing from that experience.
- 18. Board members also took issue with Respondent's recordkeeping, which continued to be poor even though he had been sanctioned in the past for deficiencies in his patient charts.
- 19. The standard of care when the patient has a CSPMP profile that shows he received additional narcotics from other providers requires a physician to address this

finding with the patient and discontinue narcotic medications or a narcotics contract signed.

- 20. Respondent deviated from the standard of care by providing early prescriptions of narcotic medications after a CSPMP query showed that DS received narcotics from other sources.
- 21. There was potential to propagate narcotic prescription misuse and abuse. There was also potential for overdose on the narcotic prescriptions.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Board possesses jurisdiction over the subject matter hereof and over Respondent.
- 2. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(e) ("[f]ailing or refusing to maintain adequate records on a patient.")
- 3. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(q) ("[a]ny conduct or practice that is or might be harmful or dangerous to the health of the patient or the public.").

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. Respondent is issued a Letter of Reprimand.
- 2. Respondent is placed on probation for three years with the following terms and conditions:

a. Monitor

Respondent shall within 30 days of the effective date of this order, enter a contract with a Board pre-approved monitoring company ("the Monitor") to provide all

monitoring services. Respondent shall bear all costs of monitoring requirements and services.

b. Chart Reviews

The Monitor shall conduct quarterly chart reviews. Based upon the chart reviews, the Board retains jurisdiction to take additional disciplinary or remedial action.

c. Obey All Laws

Respondent shall obey all state, federal and local laws, all rules governing the practice of medicine in Arizona, and remain in full compliance with any court ordered criminal probation, payments and other orders.

d. Tolling

In the event Respondent should leave Arizona to reside or practice outside the State or for any reason should Respondent stop practicing medicine in Arizona, Respondent shall notify the Executive Director in writing within ten days of departure and return or the dates of non-practice within Arizona. Non-practice is defined as any period of time exceeding thirty days during which Respondent is not engaging in the practice of medicine. Periods of temporary or permanent residence or practice outside Arizona or of non-practice within Arizona, will not apply to the reduction of the probationary period.

RIGHT TO PETITION FOR REHEARING OR REVIEW

Respondent is hereby notified that he has the right to petition for a rehearing or review. The petition for rehearing or review must be filed with the Board's Executive Director within thirty (30) days after service of this Order. A.R.S. § 41-1092.09(B). The petition for rehearing or review must set forth legally sufficient reasons for granting a rehearing or review. A.A.C. R4-16-103. Service of this order is effective five (5) days after date of mailing. A.R.S. § 41-1092.09(C). If a petition for rehearing or review is not filed, the Board's Order becomes effective thirty-five (35) days after it is mailed to Respondent.

1	Respondent is further notified that the filing of a motion for rehearing or review
2	required to preserve any rights of appeal to the Superior Court.
3	DATED AND EFFECTIVE this 8th day of Avgust, 2013.
4	
5	ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD
6	
7	By Lisa S. Wynn
8	Executive Director
9	
10	EXECUTED COPY of the foregoing mailed
11	this Sto day of Quegue t, 2013 to:
12	Scott J. Hergenroether, Esq. Ledbetter Law Firm
13	1003 Main Street Cottonwood, AZ 86326
14	ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed
15	this Star day of august, 2013 with:
16	Arizona Medical Board 9545 E. Doubletree Ranch Road
17	Scottsdale, AZ 85258
18	
19	Mary Boby
20	Arizona Medical Board Staff
21	
22	
23	

is